

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are all the claims pending in the application, the claims having been editorially amended. Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Submitted herewith is a corrected drawing showing the labeling requested by the examiner.

Regarding the claim objection stated in paragraph 4 of the Office action, it appears that the examiner has examined the claims of the PCT application as originally filed and not the claims as amended in the preliminary amendment submitted at the time of national stage entry on February 13, 2002. The amended claims do not use the word "characterized".

The double patenting rejection stated in paragraph 21 of the Office action is respectfully traversed. Copending application 09/974,836 is directed to solving the problem of browser hang-up, and all of the claims in that application recite a browser overrule signal for overruling the browser when it is hung-up. This concept does not appear in the claims of the present application, and applicants do not see any basis for the obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

The prior art rejections stated in paragraphs 6-20 of the Office action are respectfully traversed.

The present invention seeks to provide a more user-friendly telecommunications system by having the system be responsive to different users in different ways. In the system shown in Fig. 1, a user 2 generates a control signal indicating he wants to see the weather. This control

signal results in generation of a URL which is routed to a switch 3 where generator 32 generates an IP address for the weather information in the area (e.g., Brussels) in which user 2 is located, and sends this IP address back to the user terminal 2. User terminal 2 then sends this IP address to switch 4 where it is used to address memory 94 and obtain weather information for Brussels.

When the same user is in Paris, he may generate the same control signal (e.g., URL) as when in Brussels, but this time the URL is sent to switch 5 where a generator responds by generating an IP address corresponding to Paris weather, and this is sent back to the user terminal whose browser then uses the IP address to address memory 94 and obtain Paris weather information.

Gupta et al (WO 99/60459) is directed to providing more effective traffic localization through a DNS (Domain Name System). A distributed server system has servers at different locations, and when a user seeks to access a server a “local resolver” converts the URL to the IP address that is “best” for the client in terms of efficient use of network resources. There is no discussion in Gupta et al of the concept of providing different capabilities to different terminals who enter the same URL from different locations.

Ebrahim is similar in teaching load management over a distributed system, with no suggestion of the advantages of providing different service(s) to users at different locations who enter identical URLs.

A feature common to the cited prior art is that the function of the distributed server arrangement is to provide the same information to the user from different servers, choosing the server that is most efficient. In contrast, the purpose of the present invention is to customize the

USSN 10/049,507  
Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

information provided to the user, i.e., providing different information different users who enter the same URL or providing different information to a single user who enters the same URL from different locations. This aspect of the invention has been emphasized in the amendments now made to the independent claims. The cited art does not teach this, nor would it have resulted from any obvious combination of the teachings of the cited art.

For the above reasons, I submit that the invention defined in the present claims is neither shown nor suggested in the cited art, and allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David J. Cushing  
Registration No. 28,703

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
23373  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 22, 2004

USSN 10/049,507  
Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

One (1) sheet of replacement drawings are attached which are believed to overcome the Examiner's objections.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s)